



Interview Summary

Application No.

08/791,240

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

Alexander J. Ryncarz

•	Bradley L. Sisson	1634	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			43
(1) Bradley L. Sisson	(3) <u>Linda Buckley, Reg. No</u> .	31,003	
(2) Robert L. Buchanan, Reg. No. 40,927	(4)		
Date of Interview 26 Oct 1998	-		
Type: 🛚 Telephonic 🗆 Personal (copy is given to	applicant applicant's repr	resentative).	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:	No. If yes, brief description:		
Agreement X was reached.	·		
Claim(s) discussed: 1-58		10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	
Identification of prior art discussed: Mullis (US Patent 4,683,202); Davis et al. (US Patent 5,35 Patent 5,627,054).	91,480); Kiessling (US Patent 5,6	118,664); and	Gillespie (US
Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if Mr. Buckley indicated that applicant is prepared to file a debenefit of priority to a provisional application that was filed priority would effectively remove the Gillespie reference as 1996. Mr. Sisson indicated that the result of overcoming indicated that they would consider filing a CPA. Mr. Sisson steps as no means nor active step is recited whereby one terminus is not hybridized to the template nucleic acid. M be faxed to the PTO tomorrow proposed language for claim	eclaration and amend the specific of in January 1996. Mr. Sisson in a available prior art which has an Gillespie would require a further a n expressed concern over claim would be able to effect a primer r. Buchanan and Ms. Buckley ind	eation to reflect dicated that su effective filing search. Mr. Bu 1 not reciting s extension whe	t a claim for uch a claim for date of April 5, uchanan sufficient method in the 3'
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amen the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no co is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)			
1. 🗵 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ	ate record of the substance of th	ie interview.	
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUSECTION 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF	JDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE IN s already been filed, APPLICANT	NTERVIEW. (S IS GIVEN ONI	ee MPEP
 Since the Examiner's interview summary above (in each of the objections, rejections and requirement claims are now allowable, this completed form is of Office action. Applicant is not relieved from provisis also checked. 	s that may be present in the last considered to fulfill the response	Office action, requirements o	and since the of the last
Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an a	ttachment to a signed Office series		





Interview Summary

Application No.

08/791,240

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

Alexander J. Ryncarz

	Br	adley L. Sisson	1634	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representati	ve, PTO personnel)	:	/	Daz 2 of 3
(1) Bradley L. Sisson	(3) <u>L</u>	inda Buckley, Reg. No	. 31,003	
(2) Robert L. Buchanan, Reg. No. 40,927	(4)			
Date of Interview 26 Oct 1998				
Type: X Telephonic Personal (copy is give	n to 🗌 applican	t 🗌 applicant's rep	resentative).	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:	Yes 🛛 No. If ye	es, brief description:		
Agreement X was reached. was not reache	d.			
Claim(s) discussed: 1-58				
Identification of prior art discussed: Mullis (US Patent 4,683,202); Davis et al. (US Patent 5,627,054).	ent 5,391,480); K	iessling (US Patent 5,	618,664); and	l Gillespie (US
Mr. Sisson expressed concern over the aspect of pointing to page 46, lines 3-11, of the specification paragraph), Mr. Sisson pointed to how that definite claim 11. Mr. Sisson suggested that if the specifical deternative wording could possibly be adopted what to delineate.	"substantially iden n (see also the respion does not fit the ation does not pro	tical" being indefinite. conse of 05 October is current usage of the vide a clear definition	In response 1998 at page term in at lead of this usage	to Mr. Buchanan 4, last st the instance of of the term, then
Mr. Sisson indicated that the aspect of performing				
in the art at the time the invention was made. Mi	. Sisson pointed to	how claim 58 is cons	sidered to emb	ody a competitive
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of t the claims allowable must be attached. Also, who is available, a summary thereof must be attached.	ere no copy of the			
1. 🛛 It is not necessary for applicant to provide	a separate record	of the substance of the	ne interview.	
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MU Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARAGRAPH OF THE PARAG	ST INCLUDE THE Saction has already I	UBSTANCE OF THE I	NTERVIEW. (T IS GIVEN OI	See MPEP
 Since the Examiner's interview summary each of the objections, rejections and required claims are now allowable, this completed Office action. Applicant is not relieved from is also checked. 	irements that may form is considered	be present in the last to fulfill the response	Office action requirements	, and since the of the last
Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form uples:	it is an attachment to	a signed Office action		





Interview Summary

Application No.

08/791,240

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

Alexander J. Ryncarz

	Bradley L. Sisson	1634
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):	page 3 of 3
(1) Bradley L. Sisson	(3) Linda Buckley, Reg. No.	31,003
(2) Robert L. Buchanan, Reg. No. 40,927	(4)	
Date of Interview	_	
	applicant applicant's rep	resentative).
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes	No. If yes, brief description:	
Agreement X was reached. was not reached.		
Claim(s) discussed: 1-58	•	
Identification of prior art discussed: Mullis (US Patent 4,683,202); Davis et al. (US Patent 5,33 Patent 5,627,054).	91,480); Kiessling (US Patent 5,6	18,664); and Gillespie (US
non-competitive form of amplification as the two primers a	re being directed to different tar	get polynucleotide sequences.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amen the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no co is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
1. X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ		
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUSED Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF	JDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE IN s already been filed, APPLICANT	NTERVIEW. (See MPEP IS GIVEN ONE MONTH
 Since the Examiner's interview summary above (in each of the objections, rejections and requirement claims are now allowable, this completed form is of Office action. Applicant is not relieved from provisis also checked. 	s that may be present in the last considered to fulfill the response	Office action, and since the requirements of the last
Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an a	ttachment to a signed Office action.	